

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Amendment dated July 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2006

REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 30 and 35 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 27 and 32 to further clarify the invention. Claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 27, 30-32 and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,371,781 (Ardon). Claims 28 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ardon.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 27, 30-32 and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ardon. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Ardon discloses a system and method for delivering called party identification to a call telephone wireless station set during paging of the called wireless telephone, or after call set-up but before ringing starts. A control unit may then cause the called line to be displayed, may cause a distinctive ring to be made, or take other action depending upon its program.

Regarding claims 27 and 32, Applicant submits that Ardon does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, receiving a request for a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, or transmitting information to the first mobile terminal indicating a number of the second mobile terminal that received the transferred call. The Examiner asserts that Ardon discloses receiving a request from a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, at col.5, lines 29-57. However, these portions merely disclose details regarding a call pick up feature where while a call is being set up to a first cellular device, messages are sent to other devices allowing the other devices to indicate a desire to pick up the call, whereby the call is then sent to this device. This is not receiving a request from a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing, as recited in the claims of the present application. Ardon discloses

receiving the request during call set up and before ringing and in response to a message sent to the other device. As also disclosed in the abstract of Ardon, the activities in Ardon occur after call set up but before ringing starts. Ardon teaches away from the limitations in the claims of the present application.

Further, Ardon does not disclose or suggest transmitting information to the first mobile terminal indicating a number of the second mobile terminal that received the transferred call. As noted previously, Ardon merely discloses that during a call set up a message is sent to other devices allowing them to pick up and answer a call directed to a different mobile device. Ardon does not disclose or suggest transmitting information to the first mobile terminal indicating a number of the second mobile terminal that received the transferred call after the call is transferred. Ardon merely discloses displaying the number being called thus allowing another phone to request pick up of the call. In contrast, according to embodiments of the present invention, a first mobile terminal knows the identity of the mobile terminal that picked up the call, since information regarding the number of the second mobile terminal that received the transferred call is transmitted to the first mobile terminal. This is not disclosed or suggested by Ardon.

Regarding claims 31, 34 and 36, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 27 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Serial No. **10/626,580**

Docket No. **SI-0039**

Amendment dated July 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2006

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Ardon does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 27, 31, 32, 34 and 36 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 28 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ardon. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 27 and 32 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Ardon does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 28 and 33 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/626,580**
Amendment dated July 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2006

Docket No. **SI-0039**

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: July 12, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2029\2029-036\92379.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610